

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 9 and 10 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to include the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Law et al. (U.S. Patent 5,733,674) in view of a newly cited reference of Kessler et al. (U.S. Patent 6,119,864). The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Law et al. in view of Kessler and further in view of Kfouri et al. (U.S. Patent 6,049,192). The Examiner has rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Law et al. in view of Kessler and further in view of Jennings et al. (U.S. Patent 5,954,531).

The Examiner asserts that Law et al. teaches a battery charger for a mobile phone having all the elements of Claim 1, except that there is no obstruction between the first slot and the second slot, which is allegedly taught by the newly cited reference of Kessler et al. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner is incorrect.

The present invention teaches a two-slot type battery charger for a battery pack attached to a phone and an additional, unattached battery pack where there is no obstruction between the slots. In the present invention, by opening the front part of the slots of the battery charger, the battery pack combined with the mobile phone and the reserve battery pack separated from the mobile phone can be simultaneously charged, fabrication of the battery charger becomes easier, and the size of the battery charger is reduced (see Figs. 3 and 8, and page 11, lines 7-11 of the Specification).

Kessler et al. teaches a drawer 110 of storage device to accommodate batteries or pharmaceutical products of varying sizes having a recessed floor 112 and a plurality of slots 116.

The Examiner assets that the button batteries are kept separated without the use of an actual obstruction between compartments in Fig. 6C of Kessler et al. However, the slots 116 of Kessler et al. are separated by positive interference slots 181, 183, 185 (see Figs 6C, 8A and 8B, and column 5, lines 18-26). Obstructions, such as positive interference slots, do actually exist between slots 116. These obstructions are necessary for securing the batteries in the slots due to the complex design within the storage device and are not mere surplusage.

Moreover, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious that Kessler's concept could be implemented in Law's battery charger design. However, even assuming that the button batteries of Kessler et al. are kept separated without the use of an actual obstruction between compartments, the drawer 110 of Kessler is a storage device merely to accommodate batteries or pharmaceutical products of simple cylindrical shape, not a battery *charger* for a mobile phone. Further, a mobile phone with battery and reserve battery cannot occupy a plurality of slots 116 of Kessler et al. There is no motivation or suggestion to combine the drawer of Kessler et al. with a battery charger for a mobile phone.

In summary, neither Law et al. nor Kessler et al. teach a battery charger for a mobile phone having a first slot and a second slot such that there is no obstruction between the first and second slots, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Law et al. and Kessler et al. fail to disclose all the features of Claim 1, and that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

If the above argument puts Claim 1 in condition for allowance, then, at least because of their dependence on Claim 1, dependent Claims 2-11 will also be in condition for allowance.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely, Claims 1-11, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/JWK